

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

A Preliminary Amendment to the above-identified application was submitted at National Phase Entry. The listing of claims above incorporates all of the claim amendments from the listing of claims presented in the Preliminary Amendment. It is noted that the June 9, 2009 Office Action (i.e. the Restriction Requirement) failed to take into account the Preliminary Amendment. In this regard, the Office Action stated that claim 1-94 are pending and are subject to restriction; whereas after the Preliminary Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 29, 32, 37-43, 45, 47, 52, 54-56, 65, 71, 72, 74-78, 80, 81, 84, 85, 87, 88, 90 and 92-95 remained pending, because claims 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19-28, 30, 31, 33-36, 44, 46, 48-51, 53, 57-64, 66-70, 73, 79, 82, 83, 86, 89 and 91 were cancelled, and claim 95 was added. Claims 1, 39, 56, 65 and 74 are independent claims and all of the other claims are dependent claims.

Only claims 38 and 39 have been further amended by the present Response. The method now defined in independent claim 39 includes all of the limitations of claim 1.

Turning now to the Office Action, the issues raised therein are discussed below.

ELECTION:

Applicants hereby elect Group I, drawn to a framed panel unit. Although the Examiner identified claim 1-18 as belonging to Group I, such determination by the Examiner was based on the original claims rather than the claims as amended by the Preliminary Amendment filed May 4, 2006. It is clear that, after the Preliminary Amendment, claim 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 29, 32, 37, 38 and 92-95 are directed to a “framed panel unit” and thus clearly belong to elected Group I.

In light of the remarks below, it is further respectfully submitted that claims 39-43, 45, 47, 52, 54 and 55 should be examined together with the Group I claims mentioned above.

That is, independent method claim 39 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 1, and therefore claim 39 as well as claims 40-43, 45, 47, 52, 54 and 55 which depend from claim 39, should be examined together with the Group I claims mentioned above.

Of claims 56-73 and 92-94, which were identified as Group IV on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 56, 65, 71, 72 and 92-94 remain in the application. However, claims 92-94 depend from claim 1 and therefore belong to Group I as discussed above.

Claims 74-91 were identified in the Office Action as Group V, and claims 74-78, 80, 81, 84, 85, 87, 88 and 90 remain in the application.

Finally, claim 95 which was added in the Preliminary Amendment depends from claim 1 and thus belongs in Group I as discussed above.

The Applicants also expressly reserve the right to pursue patent protection for the subject matter of any non-elected claims, which have been withdrawn, in one or more divisional applications.

CONCLUSION:

It is believed that the present response fully addresses the restriction requirement made in the Office Action.

Applicants look forward to early and favorable reconsideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael GLOVER et al.

/Charles R Watts/

By 2009.11.16 12:55:12 -05'00'

Charles R. Watts

Registration No. 33,142

Attorney for Applicants

CRW/cbc
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 16, 2009